

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/691,632	10/18/2000	Shervin Moloudi	40689/CAG/B600 7054		
23363	7590 12/04/2002				
	ARKER & HALE, LI		EXAMINER		
350 WEST COLORADO BOULEVARD SUITE 500		RD	MILORD, MARCEAU		
PASADENA,	CA 91105		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER		
			2685		
			DATE MAILED: 12/04/2002	DATE MAILED: 12/04/2002	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	09/691,632 MOLOUDI ET AL.		
,, , ,	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Marceau Milord	2685	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 25 November 2002 FAILS TO PLATherefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appel Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	evoid abandonment of this applicantly a timely filed amendment which	ation. A proper reply h places the applica	y to a Ition in
PERIOD FOR R	EPLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the maili			
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WA 706.07(f).	later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	g date of the final rejection	on.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Off timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37	of extension and the corresponding amo f the shortened statutory period for reply fice later than three months after the mai	unt of the fee. The approriginally set in the final	opriate extension Office action; or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant' 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered by	pecause:		
(a) they raise new issues that would require furth	ner consideration and/or search (s	see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note	below);		
(c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or sir	mplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without cance	ling a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claim	S.
NOTE:			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection	tion(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	d be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed	amendment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request fo application in condition for allowance because: Set		dered but does NO	T place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaused by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY t	o issues which were	e newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims w			and an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-31</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

10. Other: ____

8. The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.

9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The references cited by the Examiner are read into the claims (see previous office action for details). Note that the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, but limitations from the specification are not read into the claims..

EDWARD F. URBAN SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600